



# 2001 NFLRC SUMMER INSTITUTE:

## Korean Pedagogy Workshop: Task-based Language Teaching

July 30–August 1, 2001

### EVALUATION

Jim Yoshioka

*University of Hawai'i at Mānoa*

---

#### CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Description of workshop activities.....	6
Evaluation of institute: Participant and administration.....	8
Appendix A: On-line application form for potential participants.....	14
Appendix B: Workshop schedule.....	16
Appendix C: Summer Institute evaluation form.....	17
Appendix D: Tabulation of evaluation form results and general comments provided .....	18



---

## INTRODUCTION

### ***2001 Summer Institute***

The 2001 NFLRC Summer Institute (SI) *Korean Pedagogy Workshop: Task-based Language Teaching* took place from July 30 to August 1, 2001 on the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa campus in Honolulu, Hawai'i. It was held in conjunction with the 6<sup>th</sup> annual American Association of Teachers of Korean (AATK) Conference (August 2–5, 2001), which immediately followed it. Both events served as professional development opportunities for American teachers of Korean, sharing technological and pedagogical innovations in the teaching of this critical language.

The opening session of the three-day Korean Pedagogy Workshop was designed to provide an overview of the rationale for Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT) with focus on form as one of its ten methodological principles and to briefly cover the six basic stages in designing, implementing, and evaluating a TBLT program:

- needs and means analysis
- syllabus design
- materials development
- choice of methodological principles and pedagogic procedures
- student assessment
- course evaluation

During the remainder of the workshop, the focus shifted to an exploration of several problems currently facing any task-based approach, such as:

- how to conduct a methodologically adequate task-based learner needs analysis
- how to select among target tasks identified by the needs analysis
- how to classify, sequence, and design pedagogic tasks when constructing a task syllabus
- how to deal with groups of learners with varying heterogeneous abilities and needs
- how to assess task-based language abilities
- how to evaluate task-based programs

At each stage, trial applications of TBLT in the University of Hawai'i's Korean as a foreign language (KFL) program were described and demonstrated, including results of a needs analysis, prototype modules of task-based KFL materials, and a video of their classroom use. Parts of the materials design and use segments were discussed in Korean, but the institute as a whole was conducted in English, via a mix of informal lecture presentations and demonstrations, classroom discussion of required readings, and project work in small groups. It was the hope and goal of this institute that the Korean language educators who participated in this workshop would leave with a sound grounding in TBLT for the teaching of Korean and be able to introduce such a program at their home institution if so desired.

### ***Organization of the SI***

Staff for the SI consisted of NFLRC staff and the workshop facilitators. The NFLRC staff included Jim Yoshioka (Program Coordinator/Summer Institute Evaluator), Deborah Masterson

(Publications Specialist), Heidi Agunias (Student Assistant), and Richard Schmidt (NFLRC Director). The workshop facilitators were Michael Long (Summer Institute Director) and Youngkyu Kim (Workshop Facilitator).

### ***Background of the SI***

During the summer of 1998, Youngkyu Kim spoke with Dr. Richard Schmidt about the possibility of doing some Korean-related projects, one of which was a Korean Summer Institute to be held in conjunction with the AATK Annual Conference, for the upcoming 1999–2002 NFLRC grant re-application. Dr. Schmidt's initial response was positive, so Mr. Kim immediately contacted Korean professor Dr. Ho-min Sohn in the East Asian Languages & Literatures (EALL) Department at UH to further discuss this possibility. His initial response was positive as well, and the three of them had an informal meeting, where they prepared a preliminary plan for this joint endeavor. As a result, this Summer Institute was included in the 1999–2002 proposal submitted to the Department of Education in Washington, D.C.

At the fourth AATK annual conference and teacher training workshop in Columbus, Ohio in August 1999, Dr. Sohn formally proposed that (1) the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa would hold the sixth AATK annual conference and teacher training workshop in August 2001 and (2) the AATK conference would be held jointly with the International Association of Korean Language Education (IAKLE), which was approved. It was also reported to the then-AATK officers and board members that the NFLRC would be interested in holding a Korean Summer Institute on Task-based Language Teaching, focusing on Korean, prior to the AATK teacher training workshop.

After Dr. Joe Ree at Florida State University was elected president of AATK at the fifth AATK annual conference and teacher training workshop in Los Angeles in August 2000, he formally requested that the NFLRC provide to AATK details of the proposed NFLRC Korean Summer Institute and how the NFLRC could assist with the sixth AATK annual conference and teacher training workshop. Richard Schmidt and Youngkyu Kim worked on a formal letter, explicitly delineating what the NFLRC could and would provide for and not, regarding the AATK conference and teacher training workshop. Some of the items included in the letter were:

1. The NFLRC would provide Youngkyu Kim's assistance to AATK to act as a local coordinator;
2. A priority would be given to AATK members' application to the NFLRC's Korean Summer Institute; and
3. The NFLRC would provide AATK with computer lab facilities and lab monitor assistance for AATK's teacher training workshop on computer-based language teaching.

In return, the NFLRC would be credited for its assistance with the AATK annual conference and teacher training workshop and its provision of the Korean Pedagogy Workshop to AATK members.

### ***Publicity for the 2001 SI***

Advertising to solicit participants for the SI followed the pattern of previous NFLRC Summer Institutes. Flyers and ads (designed by Publications Specialist Deborah Masterson) were distributed at professional conventions, such as the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) conference in Boston (November, 2000) and the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL) conference in St. Louis (February, 2001). In addition, notices were sent to a number of professional Korean language teaching organizations, such as the American Association of Teachers of Korean (AATK), the International Association of Korean Language Education (IAKLE), and the Applied Linguistics Association of Korea (ALAK), as well as pertinent academic institutions. Email ads were sent to people on the NFLRC mailing list and to a number of Korean language listservs (particularly the AATK listserv). Most of the internet publicity as well as the Summer Institute website (now located at <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/prodev/kor2001/default.html>) was done by Program Coordinator Jim Yoshioka. The Summer Institute was highlighted on the main page of the NFLRC website and in its Summer Institute section.

As mentioned above, because of the joint nature of this event, AATK also provided publicity for both the workshop and the conference via its website (<http://www.fsu.edu/~aatk/>), newsletters, and other communications to its members.

### ***Selection of participants***

Potential participants applied by completing a web-based application form available on the NFLRC website (see Appendix A). A total of 35 Korean language educators applied for the workshop. The applications were rated holistically by two of the SI organizers, primarily based upon the applicants' statements of purpose, where they were to describe their understanding of what TBLT is, any information about experiences they have had in the area of TBLT in Korean, their reasons for wanting to participate in the 2001 Korean Pedagogy Summer Institute, and their plans to implement/disseminate what they would learn during the workshop.

Of the 35 applicants, 25 were accepted. (Typically, the NFLRC accepts only around 15 applicants for a given workshop, but because we knew that many Korean educators would be coming to the AATK Conference and we wanted to provide increased opportunities, the NFLRC decided to increase the number to 25 this time). Applications that were rejected were generally incomplete, provided far too brief information, or did not address the issues requested for the statement of purpose. Ultimately, the actual number of participants who attended was 22, after a few of those accepted had to cancel for various reasons before the institute.

### ***Pre-institute communications***

After the selection of the participants, the NFLRC was in frequent contact with each participant. Jim Yoshioka sent the usual congratulatory email message to those selected, followed by an acceptance packet (containing a letter of invitation, a registration form, a health insurance verification form, per diem information/forms, and detailed information about optional

accommodations, transportation, parking, meals, and services at the Summer Institute). He sent frequent email reminders about upcoming deadlines and about taking care of travel arrangements in a timely matter, answered any queries they sent his way, and took care of any problems or requests (e.g., parking passes) that arose as they prepared to come to Hawai'i. He also sent copies of the three articles that were required reading for the workshop in advance to those who requested them. The Korean Summer Institute webpage, in addition, provided supplemental information for the participants.

### ***Facilities***

The SI took place in the Moore 155A conference room, which was equipped with an opaque projector, a TV/VCR unit, and a computer cart with LCD projector for demonstration purposes. The room contained 30 chairs for facilitators and participants to sit in. Morning and afternoon refreshments were served in the hallway outside of the room. The opening and closing receptions for the SI were held in the Student Services Center's panoramic room 412 and the NFLRC main office, respectively.

---

## **DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHOP ACTIVITIES**

### ***General overview***

The three days of the workshop were devoted to giving the participants an overview of task-based language teaching (TBLT), covering the six stages of TBLT program development, complete with a number of examples and modules, and focusing specifically on the teaching of Korean. Appendix B contains the workshop schedule that was included in the Summer Institute program.

### ***Participant profile***

The participants represented universities, colleges, and high schools across the US (California, Florida, Hawai'i, Michigan, & New York, mainly) as well as some from Korea and Canada. In addition, a few of the participants came from the U.S. Defense Language Institute in Monterey, California, the Foreign Service Institute of the U.S. Department of State, and the KRSOC Joint Language Center of the U.S. Department of Defense. All participants whose work impacts American students learning Korean received per diems to help defray the cost of coming to and staying in Hawai'i (per NFLRC grant regulations). Participants who do not teach Korean at American institutions or to American students accepted with the understanding that they would not be receiving a per diem.

### ***Facilitator profiles***

As noted before, the SI was facilitated by Michael Long and Youngkyu Kim from the Department of Second Language Studies at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, both of whom

are key people in the current NFLRC project *Task-based Language Teaching in Foreign Language Education*.

**Michael Long**, Professor, was primarily responsible for reviewing the theory and research underpinnings of TBLT and discussing the various stages in the design, implementation, and evaluation of a TBLT program. He teaches courses in second language acquisition, classroom research, language teaching methodology, L2 research methods, and Task-based Language Teaching, in the M.A. in ESL, Advanced Graduate Certificate in Second Language Studies, and Ph.D. in SLA Programs at UH. He is the author of over 100 articles and several books, and in 1991 was co-recipient of TESOL's International Research Prize. He serves on the Editorial Boards of *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *Language Teaching Research*, and *Estudios de Linguística Aplicada*, and is co-editor of the *Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series*. His current research includes work on SLA theory change, negative feedback, sensitive periods, Task-based Language Teaching, and a (thus far, fifteen-year) longitudinal study of stabilization/fossilization in the interlanguage of a Japanese immigrant to Hawai'i. The next eighteen months will see publication of four books: *Task-Based Language Teaching* (Blackwell), *Problems in SLA* (Lawrence Erlbaum), *Second Language Needs Analysis* (Cambridge), and (co-edited with Cathy Doughty) *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (Blackwell).

**Youngkyu Kim**, a Ph.D. candidate in Second Language Acquisition, was primary responsible for the illustration of these stages using English and Korean examples, many of them drawn from the NFLRC project and including a small-scale demonstration of TBLT in selected classes of the Korean program at UH Mānoa. His research interests include L2 learning (esp., input and interaction), L2 teaching (esp., reading and vocabulary), L2 research methods (esp., meta-analysis), and L2 testing (esp., task-based assessment and assessment of interlanguage pragmatics). He is co-author of the NFLRC Research Notes *Developing Korean language performance assessments* and *Pilot instruments for assessing cross-cultural pragmatics in nonnative learners of Korean*.

### **Workshop activities**

Each day of the SI followed basically the same format — morning refreshments served at 9:00, a three-hour morning session from 9:30 to 12:30, lunch, a three-hour afternoon session from 1:30 to 4:30 (afternoon refreshments around 3:00), and an optional end-of-the-day social event (see Appendix B).

Required reading for the SI included the following three articles, which were discussed at various points during the workshop:

Long, M. H. (2000). Focus on form in Task-Based Language Teaching. In Lambert, R. D., & Shohamy, E. (Eds.), *Language policy and pedagogy. Essays in honor of A. Ronald Walton* (pp. 179–92). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Long, M. H. (to appear). Methodological issues in learner needs analysis. To appear in Long, M. H. (Ed.), *Second Language Needs Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, cognitive resources and second language syllabus design: A triadic framework for examining task influences on SLA. In Robinson, P. (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

On the morning of the first day, after the official opening of the workshop, Dr. Michael Long presented a general overview of TBLT, which included a comparison of the three general approaches to language teaching, discussion of the six stages in developing a TBLT program,

focus on form as one of its key methodological components, and connections of this model to current research and theory in second language acquisition (SLA). During the afternoon session, he focused on the first stage, namely, conducting a task-based needs analysis to identify target tasks. His discussion covered a broad survey of the methodological issues involved in doing a needs analysis. The day concluded with an opening reception at the Student Services Center's panoramic room 412 (food, drink, and welcoming leis for the participants).

On the second day of the workshop, Dr. Long and Youngkyu Kim covered the next three stages, namely issues related to task syllabus design and the design of pedagogic tasks, demonstrating and discussing materials developed as part of the NFLRC project and other sources. These NFLRC project prototype materials were made available to participants to help them develop their own at their home institutions. The day concluded with an optional lei-making lesson (a chance for participants to learn a bit more about Hawaiian culture while here) taught by Heidi Agunias, NFLRC Student Assistant, in the NFLRC Main Office to those interested in learning.

The final day was primarily devoted to the last two stages, implementing a TBLT syllabus with appropriate methodological and pedagogical considerations (drawing on pertinent SLA theory and research) and assessing student achievement using task-based, criterion-referenced, performance tests/evaluating the program. The SI ended with a closing reception at the NFLRC Main Office, complete with a selection of tasty local pupus (appetizers).

---

## EVALUATION OF INSTITUTE : P ARTICIPANT AND ADMINISTRATION

### **Summative**

At the end of the workshop, all 22 participants completed a summative evaluation form (see Appendix C). The participant responses to the evaluation questions are tabulated in Appendix D and include the additional general comments some of them wrote. The results are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1: Participant responses to workshop evaluation; N=22**  
1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree

item	question	mean
1	The Institute provided me with a useful introduction to TBLT.	3.7
2	The Institute made me reflect on my customary teaching practices.	3.2
3	The Institute covered theoretical TBLT issues adequately for me.	3.5
4	The Institute covered practical TBLT issues adequately for me.	3.0
5	The Institute provided concrete examples of each stage of a TBLT program.	3.4
6	There was time for me to ask questions or comment on issues and examples.	3.4



7	I would be interested in implementing a complete TBLT program for teaching KFL at the institution where I work.	3.4
8	I would be interested in implementing some aspects of a TBLT program for supplementing the teaching of KFL at the institution where I work.	3.5
9	I would like to learn more about TBLT.	3.5
10	The room and facilities were adequate for the Institute.	3.0
11	The social arrangements for the Institute (refreshments, lunches, reception, lei-making, closing ceremony, etc.) were adequate.	3.5
12	My accommodations for the Institute (Lincoln Hall, Hale Mānoa dormitory, etc.) were adequate.	2.95
13	I made useful personal contacts with other KFL teachers as a result of the Institute.	3.3

In general, almost all areas discussed in the evaluation form received a majority of high marks (mainly “strongly agree” and “agree”). Participants in particular spoke highly of the very informative introduction to TBLT the workshop offered (especially in the realm of TBLT theoretical issues), Dr. Long’s presentations and discussions, and the various social events planned by Jim Yoshioka. Many expressed great interest in learning more about TBLT beyond the institute, saying that they were planning on implementing a TBLT program either in part or fully at their home institutions (which was one of the hopes for this workshop). At the same time, there were a few participants who said they were not interested in implementing TBLT and that the institute did not really cause them to reflect on their customary teaching practices.

The participants seemed satisfied with the concrete examples provided regarding each stage of a TBLT program and with the amount of time provided for asking questions and discussion throughout the workshop. One area, however, that participants would have liked more examples and discussion of revolved around the practical issues involved with a TBLT program; about a quarter of the participants felt that these practical aspects were not covered nearly enough.

The two areas that got a number of complaints and negative comments were the Summer Institute facilities and the accommodation options. Quite a few found Moore 155A (the conference room the workshop was housed in) to be too cold and the chairs in it to be uncomfortable to sit in for the three-hour morning and afternoon sessions. One participant mentioned that chairs with desks attached would have been much more conducive to note-taking during the workshop.

The coldness of Moore 155A has always been a chronic complaint but something that we have been unable to fix. Luckily, however, the air conditioning system in Moore Hall will be overhauled and fixed in summer 2002, so hopefully, this will not be a problem for future Summer Institutes utilizing the room. The suggestion regarding more comfortable seats with a writing surface available is a good one (which we hadn’t thought of when planning this institute), but when we have future workshops like this, we will attempt to schedule them in a regular classroom for ease of note-taking. (A classroom would also provide more room to move around in than Moore 155A).

Regarding the question about SI accommodations, the responses ran the entire gamut, from liking the accommodations to absolutely hating them, and this was dependent largely on which of the various lodging situations they opted for. Many of them stayed at Lincoln Hall, which offers the best on-campus lodging at a great price (\$61/night for a one-bedroom apartment and \$46/night for a studio, some with kitchenettes and both with A/C, cable TV, and private bathroom). People are generally quite satisfied with their stay there. Other participants stayed in Hale Mānoa (a graduate student dorm) for \$33/night in a double room with shared bathroom and kitchen facilities. Some appreciate the cheaper fees and know that they will be getting more modest, no-frills accommodations; others dislike dorms but end up staying there anyway. The big complaint, however, was with the lower campus student apartments. The NFLRC generally does not reserve rooms there, but because of a mix-up in communications between the participants, AATK, and the NFLRC, two participants were housed there, particularly because they had children with them and wanted to be next door to each other. The conditions ended up being horrible (filthy, noisy, infested with bugs, untrained staff, etc.). One of the participants moved out immediately and stayed at a hotel. Jim Yoshioka helped the other get a room at a local hotel for her and her family. Because of the deplorable conditions, Jim Yoshioka complained to the Student Housing Conference Housing office, and the two participants did not have to pay for their brief time there. (The NFLRC had complaints also from the Turkish team of our first 2001 Summer Institute — the same sort of problems — but the Student Housing Conference Housing office assured us that the problems would be taken care of. They obviously were not by the time the Korean Pedagogy Institute came around). In any case, the NFLRC has vowed never to use their services again for any Summer Institutes, so this problem will be avoided in the future.

Apart from problems with facilities and accommodations, participants were generally pleased with the TBLT content they learned at the Summer Institute and could take back with them and the various social events planned on their behalf. Overall, except for some glitches, the Summer Institute ended up being a very rewarding experience for most.

### ***Administration evaluation of the workshop***

The workshop facilitators, Dr. Mike Long and Youngkyu Kim, were asked to summarize what they thought worked well with the Korean Summer Institute and what could be improved for future workshops. Their comments follow.

Youngkyu Kim noted: “Overall, I had the impression that the workshop was well received by the participants. It may have been the first time for some (or most) of them to learn about what SLA has to do with second language (L2) teaching and why TBLT is a good example of an approach to L2 teaching, backed by empirical SLA research findings. I believe they probably appreciated the fact that Korean is now getting the attention of SLA researchers and that a concerted innovative effort in L2 teaching (e.g., TBLT) is now being experimented with in Korean, which the NFLRC is a leader in. The timing and positioning of the workshop prior to the AATK annual conference and teacher training workshop was strategically well planned as it drew attention to and participation in the workshop.

“Dr. Long’s Monday morning overview of TBLT, which was videotaped, was also shown at the AATK annual conference to those who were not able to attend the workshop. A paper, reporting the first implementation of TBLT in Korean classes at UH Mānoa in Fall 2000, was also presented at the AATK annual conference, which helped maximize the impact of the workshop.

“There were no logistical problems that I know of, but a few areas of improvement that I could think of were as follows:

**Length :** There was not a sufficient amount of time to cover TBLT in detail in a three-day workshop. The workshop was an excellent opportunity to “briefly” introduce participants to what TBLT is and is not, but the workshop could have been more effective and practical if participants had been given more time to reflect upon their overall teaching situations, including the teachers themselves, students, materials, current teaching methods, and any local logistical constraints, to come up with concrete and feasible ways of how TBLT could be implemented in their college-level Korean classes. A more direct link to application could have been emphasized. A variety of hands-on in-class activities to help participants better see how TBLT can fit in their existing (or new) curriculum would have been a great help.

**Participants :** The pool of applicants was rather limited, which resulted in selection of participants with mixed backgrounds. Variety is sometimes encouraged, but given the length of the workshop, a cohort of participants with more or less similar teaching experiences and backgrounds in SLA and L2 teaching would have allowed the workshop facilitators to spend the time more effectively, without wasting time covering the fundamentals. For example, this problem manifested itself in participants’ questions about basics in SLA and L2 teaching. This is a problem of the Korean teaching community in North America and elsewhere, not unique to the workshop, though.

**Pre-workshop preparations :** Most participants received a reading packet once they got to the workshop, and I am not sure whether they had time to read it while attending the workshop. It could have been helpful both to participants and facilitators if participants had received the packet well in advance and been given an opportunity to prepare some questions based on their reading (or ideally, to share their thoughts with prospective participants and facilitators online on an electronic discussion bulletin board, as was the case with other previous technology-focused NFLRC workshops).”

Finally, Youngkyu Kim had one further suggestion: “*Follow-up:* About six months after the workshop or at a later date, the NFLRC could send out a follow-up questionnaire to participants to ask some general questions regarding e.g., whether their experience at the workshop has been helpful or useful in their teaching, they have been able to incorporate TBLT into their teaching, and they have had an opportunity to disseminate what they have learned. This would give us the ability to assess the long-term effect of our workshop on their teaching.”

Similarly, Dr. Long felt that the workshop went well, did a good job of introducing TBLT to the Korean educators who attended, and ran into problems regarding the selection of participants: “I thought it went quite well. Certainly, the students said so in comments during and since (postcards, etc.). They got a heavy shot in the arm, not just of TBLT, but some SLA and applied linguistics, as well. For some, it seemed to be an eye-opener that there exist alternatives (whether or not you like TBLT) to just making language teaching up as you go along.

“The biggest limitation on what could be achieved was the wide range of prior knowledge and academic training people brought with them, ranging from quite a lot to none at all — in this field, at least. There also seemed to be the same generation split I have been told other

institutions suffer from among their Korean teachers, with some older folks 'knowing it all' and being highly resistant to change (anyone changing, not just themselves) and a much younger group coming in with MAs and ready to rock 'n roll. However, even the older die-hards (and there were only two or three) seemed to enjoy themselves and participated a lot. Everyone did the readings. Youngkyu performed admirably. Young-geun Lee did a good last-minute presentation of his doctoral dissertation work, at my request, and that was well received. People in class seemed relaxed but attentive. They all seemed to enjoy themselves, and I think most learned something. Logistics were very well taken care of by Jim Yoshioka."

### ***Conclusions and recommendations***

The 2001 NFLRC Summer Institute at the University of Hawai'i successfully brought together 22 Korean language educators to learn about developing and implementing a Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT) program, specifically for Korean. During the three days of the workshop, participants got a thorough introduction and theoretical grounding in TBLT, with plenty of models and examples (many from our current NFLRC TBLT project) to help them create their own TBLT program at their home institution if so desired.

The structure of the workshop appears to have worked well from both the participants' and administrators' perspectives, on the whole, although a few participants expressed a desire that there be a longer amount of time to take in and explore all the information regarding TBLT and that more of the practical aspects of implementing a TBLT program be covered. Youngkyu Kim agreed that a longer amount of time for the workshop would have allowed for more time to reflect on teaching practices and cover more of the logistics of replacing or adapting an in-place curriculum to TBLT. Fortunately, based on their responses, many of the participants were intrigued by what they learned at the workshop and intend to continue deepening their knowledge of TBLT.

Based on participant and facilitator responses, the main areas for improvement seem to center on the selection of participants, workshop facilities, and accommodation options. Because of the somewhat small pool of applicants and our desire to include a larger number than usual for the sake of Korean language educator professional development, we perhaps did not make participant selection stringent or specific enough, allowing in people with a widely varying range of experience/training with second language acquisition theory (which was not asked about in the statement of purpose on the application), second language pedagogy theory, and TBLT, which in turn caused the facilitators to spend more time on the basics in these areas instead of going further in depth with TBLT. Future Summer Institute applications and participant selection should take into account the specific audience targeted, and if it so happens that the range of applications received and applicants selected do not end up reflecting that target, the nature of the workshop should be modified accordingly and in advance to the extent possible. (As has happened in the past, sometimes what the participants claim as their experience/training in their applications is actually much less in reality, something the workshop facilitators don't find out until the first day of the workshop.)

Regarding the workshop facilities, as mentioned before, if another Summer Institute is planned that is similarly lecture/demo/discussion-oriented, we will have them set up in a classroom which has the appropriate equipment available. Alternatively, if Moore 155A's air conditioning is fixed, as we hope it will be this coming summer, we can perhaps bring in tables to go with the chairs, for a more classroom-like setting.

Finally, with regards to the problems with accommodations, the NFLRC will make an extra effort to remind participants of the pros and cons of staying at Lincoln Hall and Hale Mānoa (though, sometimes availability at either may be limited due to other events happening at UH and they might not get their first choice if their primary desire is for housing on campus). As for the student apartments on lower campus, the NFLRC will not consider them as a viable housing option anymore and suggest alternative housing arrangements.

Such issues as mentioned above will be brought up and dealt with in future Summer Institute planning sessions to make the NFLRC Summer Institute even more positive and accommodating. In all, the goal of having participants advance their professional knowledge in TBLT was definitely met, and apart from a few understandable problems, the workshop was a success.

---

**APPENDIX A: ON-LINE APPLICATION FORM FOR POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS**

**2001 NFLRC SUMMER INSTITUTE**

**Korean Pedagogy Workshop:  
Task-based Language Teaching**

Interested Korean language educators teaching at the pre-collegiate or collegiate levels are welcome to apply.

Please fill out and submit this application (in English) **no later than April 16, 2001**. You will be notified by April 28, 2001 regarding the status of your application. Mahalo for your interest in participating in the 2001 NFLRC Korean Pedagogy Summer Institute!

**July 30–August 1 Workshop Application Form**

**CONTACT INFORMATION:**

Last (family) name: \_\_\_\_\_

First (given) name: \_\_\_\_\_

Position/Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Institution or affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact address (please include street address, city, state, zip code, country, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Office phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Home phone: \_\_\_\_\_ FAX number: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

- Are you currently teaching Korean in the United States? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No  
\*If "No," please explain (i.e., teaching Korean to American students in Korea, teaching Korean to Korean nationals or other groups in Korea, not currently teaching Korean, etc.)

---

---

---

- Grade or level of instruction:

---

- Title(s) of Korean courses you have taught:

---

---

---

**STATEMENT OF PURPOSE:**

In the space provided (500 words maximum), please describe in English:

- your understanding of what Task-based Language Teaching is,
- any information about experiences you have had in the area of Task-based Language Teaching in Korean,
- your reasons for wanting to participate in the 2001 Korean Pedagogy Summer Institute, and
- your plans to experiment with implementing/disseminating what you learn at the Summer Institute.

Mahalo for your interest in the 2001 Korean Pedagogy Summer Institute! Please make sure to complete all items and carefully proofread your entries before clicking the submit button. After you submit your proposal, you will receive an email confirmation message within the next few business days.

**Submit Request**

**Clear Form**

---

**APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP SCHEDULE**

---

**Monday, July 30**

- 9:00 – 9:30 Morning refreshments (coffee, tea, juice, bagels, pastries, fruit)
- 9:30 – 12:30 Overview of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)
- 12:30 – 1:30 Lunch (bento option available)
- 1:30 – 4:30 Task-based needs analysis
- 5:15 – 6:30 Welcoming reception (Student Services Center, Room 412)

---

**Tuesday, July 31**

- 9:00 – 9:30 Morning refreshments
- 9:30 – 12:30 Task syllabus design
- 12:30 – 1:30 Lunch (bento option available)
- 1:30 – 4:30 Designing pedagogic tasks
- 5:00 Lei-making lesson (optional)

---

**Wednesday, August 1**

- 9:00 – 9:30 Morning refreshments
- 9:30 – 12:30 Methodology & pedagogy
- 12:30 – 1:30 Lunch (bento option available)
- 1:30 – 4:30 Learner assessment & program evaluation
- 5:00 Closing reception (location TBA)



---

## APPENDIX C: SUMMER INSTITUTE EVALUATION FORM

Please circle one response to each of the following thirteen statements, and then write any general comments you would like in the space provided at the end.

1. The Institute provided me with a useful introduction to TBLT.  
strongly agree      agree      disagree      strongly disagree
2. The Institute made me reflect on my customary teaching practices.  
strongly agree      agree      disagree      strongly disagree
3. The Institute covered theoretical TBLT issues adequately for me.  
strongly agree      agree      disagree      strongly disagree
4. The Institute covered practical TBLT issues adequately for me.  
strongly agree      agree      disagree      strongly disagree
5. The Institute provided concrete examples of each stage of a TBLT program.  
strongly agree      agree      disagree      strongly disagree
6. There was time for me to ask questions or comment on issues and examples.  
strongly agree      agree      disagree      strongly disagree
7. I would be interested in implementing a complete TBLT program for teaching KFL at the institution where I work.  
strongly agree      agree      disagree      strongly disagree
8. I would be interested in implementing some aspects of a TBLT program for supplementing the teaching of KFL at the institution where I work.  
strongly agree      agree      disagree      strongly disagree
9. I would like to learn more about TBLT.  
strongly agree      agree      disagree      strongly disagree
10. The room and facilities were adequate for the Institute.  
strongly agree      agree      disagree      strongly disagree
11. The social arrangements for the Institute (refreshments, lunches, reception, lei-making, closing ceremony, etc.) were adequate.  
strongly agree      agree      disagree      strongly disagree
12. My accommodations for the Institute (Lincoln Hall, Hale Mānoa dormitory, etc.) were adequate.  
strongly agree      agree      disagree      strongly disagree
13. I made useful personal contacts with other KFL teachers as a result of the Institute.  
strongly agree      agree      disagree      strongly disagree

**General comments:**

**APPENDIX D: TABULATION OF EVALUATION FORM RESULTS AND  
GENERAL COMMENTS PROVIDED**

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
1. The Institute provided me with a useful introduction to TBLT.	16	6	0	0
2. The Institute made me reflect on my customary teaching practices.	9	9	4	0
3. The Institute covered theoretical TBLT issues adequately for me.	12	9	1	0
4. The Institute covered practical TBLT issues adequately for me.	7	9	5	1
5. The Institute provided concrete examples of each stage of a TBLT program.	9	12	1	0
6. There was time for me to ask questions or comment on issues and examples.	10	11	1	0
7. I would be interested in implementing a complete TBLT program for teaching KFL at the institution where I work.	12	7	2	1
8. I would be interested in implementing some aspects of a TBLT program for supplementing the teaching of KFL at the institution where I work.	13	8	1	0
9. I would like to learn more about TBLT.	12	9	1	0
10. The room and facilities were adequate for the Institute.	5	11	4	1
11. The social arrangements for the Institute (refreshments, lunches, reception, lei-making, closing ceremony, etc.) were adequate.	11	10	0	0
12. My accommodations for the Institute (Lincoln Hall, Hale Mānoa dormitory, etc.) were adequate.	8	6	3	3
13. I made useful personal contacts with other KFL teachers as a result of the Institute.	8	10	2	0

**General comments:**

- This three-day institute was very intensive and informative. The presenter is very knowledgeable and presented the subject in a very organized way. However, I think if the video demonstration was shown on the first day, it would have been easier for me to grasp the whole concept from the very first day. I also wish that there were some sort of social get-to-know maybe after formal program since for some people it's hard to initiate personal interactions. In general I appreciate Dr. Long and Mr. Yoshioka for their wonderful work.
- As I commented during the workshop, content-based learning is very popular in the New York City public school system. From this workshop, I have learned the difference between TBLT and Content Based teaching. When I return to NY City, I will hold a small workshop to introduce TBLT. I would definitely implement a complete program for teaching.

- The workshop was exceptional in terms of providing adequate support such as refreshments and etc. and informative lectures. I really want to implement TBLT for teaching KFL at my institution. I'd like to give special thanks to Dr. Long, and Jim Yoshioka, and other guest presenters.
- Seats are not comfortable enough to be sitting on 3–4 hours in a row. Too short to know and be familiar with TBLT.
- The speed was a little fast.
- This seminar gave me strong theoretical background for my actual teaching.
- It would have been nicer if we had had more comfortable chairs with arms and desks to make notes. Dr. Long gave us a valuable lecture on TBLT!
- Although it did not meet my expectations completely, the workshop was interesting enough for me to consider this TBLT syllabus as an alternative in the future classes/courses of mine. Thanks.
- Very informative